

REMARKS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 29-36, as amended, are pending in this application. Claims 1-28 have been canceled. Claims 29-36 are new. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,956,848 (Keung et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,690,480 (Maeda). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as it may be applied to new claims 29-36.

Keung et al. is directed to a system for directing specific types of telephone calls through a computer network. The system includes a plurality of telecommunications systems 2, 4 (i.e. PBX) connected to each other via the Internet 6. Each telecommunications system 2, 4 has connected to it a plurality of telephones 8 and a telephone trunk. In use, as described at Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 23-41, and Fig. 4A and col. 8, line 55 to col. 9, line 7, a caller at a telephone 8 connected to telecommunications system 2 dials a desired telephone number. If the desired telephone number is an outside number, the telecommunications system 2 connects the caller to a telephone trunk line. If the desired telephone number is an inside number, the telecommunications system 2, formats the telephone call request and sends the call to telecommunications system 4 via the computer network 6 (step 910 of Fig 4A). The telecommunications system 4 determines the desired telephone number and rings the called telephone.

New claim 29 recites:

An image communication system comprising:

*a plurality of image communications apparatuses, each of which
possessing a telephone number belonging to a first category of telephone
numbers, a telephone number belonging to a second category of telephone
numbers and a corresponding network address;*

*a first address supplying device storing telephone numbers
belonging to the first category of telephone numbers, the corresponding network*

address of each one of the plurality of image communications apparatuses and a relationship between each one the telephone numbers belonging to the first category of telephone numbers and each one of the corresponding network addresses;

a second address supplying device storing telephone numbers belonging to the second category of telephone numbers, the corresponding network address of each one of the plurality of image communications apparatuses and a relationship between each one of the telephone numbers belonging to the second category of telephone numbers and each one of the corresponding network addresses; and

a judging section included in each of the plurality image communication apparatuses, said judging section determining whether a telephone number input to one of the plurality of image communications apparatuses belongs to the first category of telephone numbers or to the second category of telephone numbers, and directing the input telephone number to the first address supplying device or to the second address supplying device based on the determination, said first or said second address supplying device providing the corresponding network address of the input telephone number to the one of the plurality of image communication apparatuses.

Keung et al. differs from claim 29 in the following respects:

(1) Keung et al. associates a network address with each telecommunication system 2, 4 and does not associate a network address with each image communication apparatus, as recited in claim 29. At col. 5, lines 23 to 41, and col. 8, line 63 to col. 9, line 7, Keung et al. clearly states that the processor 90 (see Fig. 3) of the telecommunications system 200 uses the called telephone number to determine the network address (URL) of the remote telecommunications system 2, 4 to be accessed across the computer network 220 and not the network address of the telephone connected to the telecommunications system. More specifically, at described at col. 8, line 63 to col. 9, line 7, Keung et al. states that "the computer

network address of the telecommunications system associated with the dialed number is determined at step 920 of Fig. 4".

(2) Keung et al. discloses a processor 90 which maintains single list of physical telephone extensions 230 and virtual telephone numbers 220 (see col. 5, lines 23-25 and lines 38-39). In contrast, claim 29 recites first and second address supplying devices, one of which maintains telephone numbers belonging to a first category and the other of which maintains telephone numbers belonging to a second category.

(3) Keung et al. discloses a plurality of telephone handsets each of which possesses a single telephone number (col. 5, lines 23-41). In contrast, claim 29 recites an image communications apparatus possessing a first telephone number belonging to a first category of telephone numbers and a second telephone number belonging to a second category of telephone numbers.

In summary, claim 29 is distinguished from Keung et al. by (1) the association of a network address with each image communications apparatus (i.e. message originating device), (2) by dividing the list of communications apparatus telephone numbers into two separate and distinct databases, one database belong to a first category and one database belonging to a second category and (3) by each image communications apparatus possessing telephone numbers belonging to both first and second categories of telephone numbers. In contrast, Keung et al. associates a network address with a telecommunications system and not a telephone, has only a single list of telephone numbers in a single database and associates only a single telephone number with a telephone.

The Examiner states that Keung et al. does not explicitly teach an image communications apparatus communicating image files but that Maeda teaches an image communicating apparatus, and it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Keung et al. and Maeda.

Maeda is directed to a one-touch Internet FAX apparatus which, upon receiving an Internet address from a certain destination, the apparatus is able to communicate with the same destination either by telephone, or over the Internet. A random access memory in the FAX

apparatus, stores in a single table (Fig. 3), a list of one-touch numbers, each of which is uniquely associated with another image communication apparatus. Also, associated with each one-touch number in the table is a telephone number of another communication apparatus, the presence or absence of a G3 FAX function, the presence or absence of an Internet FAX function, an Internet address and an abbreviation uniquely identifying the another image communication apparatus (Fig. 3 and col. 10, lines 26-33). The decision as to whether to transmit to another communication apparatus by way of a telephone line or by way of the Internet is determined by the presence or absence of the table entries shown in Fig. 3. According to Fig. 4, if both a telephone function and an Internet function are present, the FAX is transmitted over the Internet.

Applicant submits that Maeda does not make up for the deficiencies of Keung et al. Specifically, Maeda discloses a communications apparatus (Internet Fax 2) that stores only a single telephone number and does not teach or suggest an image communication apparatus possessing telephone number belonging to a first category of telephone numbers, a telephone number belonging to a second category of telephone numbers and a corresponding network address as recited in new claim 29.

Further, Maeda does not teach or suggest first and second address supplying devices, one of which maintains telephone numbers belonging to a first category of telephone numbers and the other of which maintains telephone numbers belonging to a second category of telephone numbers.

Applicant submits that the combination of Keung et al. and Maeda does not make new claim 29 obvious. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 1 as it may be applied to new claim 29.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since new claim 29 has been shown to be allowable, new claims 30-34, dependent on claim 29 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claims 30-34.

Claim 35 is allowable for the same reasons that claim 29 is allowable. Further, it is respectfully submitted that since new claim 35 has been shown to be allowable, new claim 36,

Application No. 09/875,075
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2006

dependent on claim 35 is allowable, at least by its dependency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claim 36.

CONCLUSION

Insofar as the Examiner's rejections have been addressed, the application is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 29-36 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

HIROSHI ENDO

June 13, 2006
(Date)

By:


LOUIS SICKLES II

Registration No. 45,803

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1294

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: lsickles@akingump.com

LS